

*Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen* (ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000): pp. 12-32.

## The Present State of the Critical Text of the Greek Psalter

by ALBERT PIETERSMA, University of Toronto

The present “Symposium über den Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen” can only be described as an idea that has come of age. Not only has it long been recognized that the sheer bulk of direct and indirect textual attestation to the Greek Psalter is so massive that only a team approach can ever hope to shape the material into an edition worthy of the Göttingen Septuaginta, but also, behold, one age passes and another dawns. Passing is the age of Hesiod’s golden race of Göttingen editors and rising is the silver race which, according to Hesiod, is “less noble by far.” In any case, the distinguished troika of Joseph Ziegler, Robert Hanhart, and John William Wevers is perhaps the last of Renaissance scholars, able to control the languages of the many daughter versions of the Septuagint. We salute their achievement, acknowledge in gratitude all they have contributed and are still contributing to the field of Septuaginta-Studien, and note with regret that Hesiod was sadly mistaken, when he claimed that “miserable age rested not on” the golden race.

There are, however, other reasons, I believe, for following the kind of team approach reflected in this symposium, one of which is the steady advance of the discipline of text-criticism. The intimate linguistic and detailed textual familiarity with the daughter versions, required, at the current stage of development, for meticulously isolating the items that are of truly text-critical value, has reached such proportions, I submit, that a team approach would seem highly recommended, if not in fact required for all future books. Moreover, the study of the daughter versions of the Septuagint in most cases has grown into full-fledged, semi-independent areas of research. Thus my own hope is that this symposium may turn out to be an adumbration of what is to come in the unfolding of the Göttingen Septuaginta.

My primary task at this symposium, as I perceive it, is to give my perspective, to this learned gathering, on the present state of the critical text of the Greek Psalter. But present state presupposes past achievements, and, beyond a shadow of a doubt, no name looms larger than that of Alfred Rahlfs. Two major works of his on the Greek Psalter still lie before us unsurpassed, his *Septuaginta-Studien* of 1907 and his edition of *Psalms and Odes* of 1931. Not only do we today stand on the shoulders of Rahlfs, but it is perhaps difficult for us fully to appreciate what Rahlfs faced when he started his edition and what he had achieved when he had finished. P. L. Hedley was certainly right in his review of *Psalmi cum Odis* when, in reaction to Brooke-McLean’s gloomy assessment of 1917 that an edition of the Septuagint was not yet possible, he [Hedley]

wrote, “... one has only to read a few pages of the Göttingen Psalter to realize that it was worth-while to attempt to produce a form that is nearer to the original than either Swete or the other editions provide.”<sup>1</sup>

Whatever critique I may offer in the course of this paper must thus be seen against a background of the profoundest indebtedness. Obviously, simply to criticize Rahlfs on the basis of late twentieth century text-criticism would be as unfair as to condemn his edition of Psalms because it fails to attain the heights of later volumes in the Göttingen Septuaginta. Yet time does march on and standards do change, and we, if we aim to advance, need to delineate what it is in the achievement of the past that we can build on and what we need to improve on; what it is we want to take along and what it is that might better be left behind.

In interaction with Rahlfs’ studies on the Greek Psalter my paper will focus on two broad areas: (1) the text-historical aspect of Psalms and (2) the current state of their critical text, with sub-sections on (a) Rahlfs’ edition of 1931 and (b) 1931–97 and beyond. It need hardly be noted that the two major aspects are as closely related as the two sides of a single coin. I begin with selected problems of the text-historical aspect.

### (1) Text history

1907 saw the publication of Rahlfs’ *Der Text des Septuaginta-Psalter*s plus an appendix “Griechische Psalterfragmente aus Oberägypten nach Abschriften von W. E. Crum,” a treatise spanning more than 250 pages. This volume laid the groundwork for his *Psalmi cum Odis*, which appeared nearly twenty-five years and a World War later (1931).

A central problem facing Rahlfs, as it had faced others before him, was the plethora of textual evidence. That is to say, for the Greek Psalter there are extant roughly ten times as many mss as for the next most-attested book of the Old Testament in Greek (Genesis).

In his earlier work, Rahlfs enumerates a total of 19 mss written in uncials or capitals (dating from the 4th to the 10th centuries), notes that the vast majority of cursive mss are representatives of the so-called vulgar Byzantine text, some one hundred and twenty exemplars of which had been collated by Holmes-Parsons in 1823,<sup>2</sup> and cites 13 papyrus and parchment texts dating from the 3rd to the 8th/9th centuries. All of these were later included in his *Psalmi cum Odis*, by which time their number had swelled to some 50. Though 19 Greek and Latin patristic sources are cited, only four (Augustine, Hesychius of Jerusalem,

---

<sup>1</sup> “The Göttingen Investigation and Edition of the Septuagint,” *Harvard Theological Review* 26 (1933) 57–72 [66].

<sup>2</sup> *Vetus Testamentum graecum cum variis lectionibus*. Tom. 3, Oxford.

Jerome, and Theodoret) were collated completely. Last but not least, Rahlfs noted the daughter versions, which form the special focus of this symposium: Bohairic, Sahidic, Ethiopic, Vetus Latina as well as the so-called Gallican or Hexaplaric Psalter, Armenian, Syriac, Syro-Palestinian, and Arabic. For obvious reasons, I will spend no time on them. The Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic and Syro-Palestinian versions were, however, not collated for *Psalmi cum Odis*.<sup>3</sup> In the case of the Armenian, this represents a retrograde step from Holmes-Parsons.

On the Greek front matters have clearly not stood still since Rahlfs' day. Numerous papyri and parchments have been added to the 50 he cites in his *Psalmi cum Odis*. To be sure, the vast majority of these are small and give us comparatively little text, but there are the exceptions such as Papyrus Chester Beatty XIII (Rahlfs 2149) and Papyrus Bodmer XXIV (Rahlfs 2110). Especially the latter is of great importance and provides a wealth of information not available to Rahlfs. I shall return to these later in my paper.

In an attempt at classifying, along textual-geographical lines, the numerous direct and indirect witnesses of which he had become aware, Rahlfs not only notes the obvious potential of the daughter versions in this regard, but also pointed to some ancient Greek texts of known provenance, for example, a leaden roll discovered on the island of Rhodes.<sup>4</sup> Those he cites in this connection are, however, by his own admission, inadequate due to their size. But as is clear from both the Septuaginta-Studien and *Psalmi cum Odis*, size did not necessarily keep Rahlfs from linking these fragments to his main text-groups.

A textually based effort at classification was launched by Rahlfs as a sequel to Friedrich Baethgen's work.<sup>5</sup> Baethgen had divided the text of the Greek Psalter into two so-called "Rezensionen." On the one side he had placed the textus receptus, i.e., the Sixtine edition of 1587, and on the other the text of the majority of mss collated by Holmes-Parsons. Rahlfs accepted Baethgen's model, though he did introduce what to him was an important refinement, namely, the substitution of ms Vaticanus (B) for the Sixtine edition. Thus in his own line-up Rahlfs placed B on the one side and the Vulgar text (G<sup>vulg</sup>) on the other. In order to determine whether certain individual witnesses show relatedness to B or to G<sup>vulg</sup> Rahlfs then selected 129 readings scattered throughout the Psalter, his two criteria for selection being (a) that a reading must be applicable to the daughter versions and (b) that *e silentio* conclusions need to be drawn for no more than one-eighth of the mss collated by Holmes-Parsons. The first criterion was meant to ensure the full participation of the daughter versions in the classification process and the second that the Vulgar text would be adequately

---

<sup>3</sup>In Rahlfs' judgement the Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Syro-Palestinian are of secondary importance, and, furthermore, lack reliable editions (Proleg. 16 note 3).

<sup>4</sup>Ra 2004 (i–iii, iv at the latest; now in Berlin).

<sup>5</sup>*Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 8 (1882) 405–59, 593–667.

represented. His arrangement then was to cite MT plus aligned Greek evidence to the left of the square bracket, with the deviant evidence being placed to the right of the bracket. The conclusion he reached was that the *ancient* Greek mss and the daughter versions are more B-related, while the younger witnesses are more related to the Vulgar text (G<sup>vulg</sup>).

Thus, in continuity with Baethgen, Rahlfs based his study of textual relationship on what may be termed a bi-polar model. Ms B is his one pole (with other ancient texts hovering in its vicinity) and the Vulgar text the other. The title of his second chapter reads: “Die beiden Hauptformen des Psaltertextes: G<sup>vulg</sup> und B nebst Genossen.” (p. 39) In order to carry forward Baethgen’s propaedeutic work he writes: “Unsere nächste Aufgabe ist es, ein deutlicheres Bild der beiden Textformen zu gewinnen und zu sehen, wie sich die uns bekannten G[=LXX]-Zeugen auf sie verteilen” (p. 40). This last statement makes clear not only that the bi-polar model is Rahlfs’ starting-point but also that all groupings of texts are to be judged in relationship to the two poles. Not surprisingly, then, he speaks throughout of “B-Lesarten” versus “Vulgärlesarten” and by extension of B-like texts and Vulgar-like texts. In point of fact, of course, the bi-polar model as such had much more ancient roots, namely, Jerome’s preface to *Sunnia et Fretela*, where the two poles are identified as the “true” Septuagint of Origen’s Hexapla and the κοινή or so-called Lucianic text.

One may well question the appropriateness of Rahlfs’ bi-polar model. Can it adequately accommodate and explain the evidence or does it perchance have a fatal flaw that tends to obscure rather than illuminate? Would it perhaps have been better, if Rahlfs had started anew, rather than following in the footsteps of Friedrich Baethgen (and, more indirectly, Jerome)? I will suggest that he should have started over. I begin with a minor point.

Rahlfs’ selection of 129 test variants is too small, particularly since one of his two poles, ms B, is absent for 22 of these. To substitute ms S for B when B is absent must be ruled inadmissible, since no group relationship between B and S has, at this stage of operations, been demonstrated. Given the rather small number of test variants, the most that could emerge would be a very provisional glimpse of relationships.

More serious, in my view, is the effect of the bi-polar model itself, since it tends to eclipse the fact that behind both poles lies the Old Greek. That is to say, the two poles or “Rezensionen” developed from a single source, as a result of which there is a vast amount of material common to B and the Vulgar text. Any argument for true relatedness, however, cannot draw on this OG stock. I will return to this point shortly.

Furthermore, to portray the Vulgar text as a “Rezension” parallel to B perhaps inadvertently gives rise to a serious anachronism, since it suggests two rival texts vying for dominance, with the Vulgar text coming out a clear winner. The white and black pieces on a chessboard come to mind. In Rahlfs’ portrayal of these rival texts battling for dominance, primary as well as secondary readings are being

cited as constituting relatedness. One suspects that Rahlfs' contention that B (and the so-called Lower Egyptian text as a whole) constitutes the recension

of Hesychius assisted his adoption of the bi-polar model of two competing Rezensionen.<sup>6</sup>

As well, Rahlfs' portrayal of the Vulgar text as the polar opposite to B tends to obscure the long trail of what *became* the Vulgar text, extending backwards to the early transmission of the Septuagintal text. Tellingly but anachronistically we are told that, for example, already ms A (v century) had Vulgar readings.<sup>7</sup> Thus, "Vulgar readings" are, as it were, retrojected into early witnesses. And as more early fragments come to light more of these supposedly Vulgar readings are uncovered. It is certainly of interest that Papyrus Bodmer XXIV (Ra 2110) shares some 230 secondary readings (based on Rahlfs' critical text) with all or part of the so-called *L* group, or the Vulgar text, some 50 with elements of *L* alone. While these are admittedly raw figures, they do suggest that much ostensibly secondary material in *L* may well be very old.

A model different from Rahlfs' is needed, I believe, one that reflects more accurately what happened; and on what happened Rahlfs gives a great deal of useful information that I have no reason to dispute. The new model needs to reflect how the text of the Septuagint developed from its pristine (and pre-B) origins to its late Byzantine shape. Rather than the bi-polar model, we might better use the metaphor of a tree, with a single beginning and subsequent branching out, but with many stunted branches on the lower part of the trunk, some of which fell off. Yet the trunk continued and produced a large crown, even if it be a lopsided one. It is one thing, in grouping the textual witnesses, to end up with many mss that show relatively little variation among themselves; it is quite another to start with two adversaries that battle for dominance. But let me be clear: I am not suggesting that Rahlfs was totally unaware of this development<sup>8</sup> but that his model, rather than elucidating such a development, militates against it. But it is troubling, nonetheless, that in his discussion of Lucian in *Psalmi cum Odis* he simply equates, without qualification, Lucian's recension with "die grosse Masse der jüngeren Hss..."<sup>9</sup>

But perhaps the greatest difficulty I have with Rahlfs' model is the way in which he determines manuscript relationships. Since Rahlfs does not begin by establishing the original text, his list can only produce profiles of witnesses, that is to say, unique configurations of, for example, zeroes and ones. In fact, what we see throughout his *Septuaginta-Studien* and *Psalmi cum Odis* is that Rahlfs draws on *both* secondary *and* original readings to forge textual relationships. At no point, for example, in his list of 129 test variants are we told what, in his

---

<sup>6</sup> *Septuaginta-Studien* §65 pp. 235–36.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. also Rahlfs' opening sentence on the so-called mixed group of mss: "Die Handschriften A 1219 55 gehen oft mit *L* zusammen, weichen aber doch so oft von *L* ab, daß man sie nicht dazu rechnen kann." *Psalmi cum Odis*, §8.1. p.70.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *Psalmi cum Odis* §7.11. p. 69. He professes, however, to be unable to separate Lucian's own text from its later corrupted form.

<sup>9</sup> §7.1. p. 60. In similar vein, though mss T and Z<sup>4</sup> are acknowledged not to contain the Vulgar text throughout, they are nonetheless lumped with *L* without real demur (§7.4).

judgement, constitutes the OG text, and when later (chapters 6–13 [pp. 141–237]) he turns his attention to the individual text-groups themselves, he makes no concerted effort to separate original readings from secondary readings. Though it is certainly true that ms B is a better witness to OG than ms 156, which he cites as D [p. 54]),<sup>10</sup> ms B can by no means be equated with OG. Thus Rahlfs fails to distinguish rigorously what in my view are two quite distinct aspects of relatedness.

The one aspect may be dubbed relatedness by virtue of the (posited) fact that all witnesses are descendants of a single original text. The human species comes to mind as a reasonably apt analogy. All humans are descendants of the original pair, Adam and Eve, says Holy Writ. Thus all members of the human species can be said to *share* certain characteristics, which distinguish the human species from other species of mammals. Having blue eyes may be tribal but having two eyes is simply human.

The other aspect of relatedness exists by virtue of the fact that within the human species, secondary characteristics *not shared* by all members of the species have developed over time. Commonly we speak of such divisions as nations, tribes, clans, and families. One might indeed construct a continuum extending from nation (or major ethnic grouping), at the one end, to a set of identical twins (or clones), at the other.

Looked at in this light, it would seem obvious that relatedness based on the shared characteristics of the species, i.e., descent from Adam and Eve, is scarcely meaningful for relatedness among humans. In precisely the same way, ms relatedness based on original readings is essentially meaningless. Differently put, original readings can only play either a neutral or a negative role. That is to say, if mss X and Y agree in a original reading they, on the one hand, cannot be said to show relatedness to each other and, on the other hand, show that they, individually, are unrelated to ms W when it sports a deviant reading. Only secondary readings, i.e., errors vis-à-vis the original, show true relatedness or affiliation, and that, of course, in widely differing degrees in direct proportion to how far removed they are from a common ancestor.<sup>11</sup> To distinguish and contrast the two aspects I would suggest we use the terms *alignment* as opposed to *affiliation*.

Since Rahlfs' list includes nothing on what constitutes the OG text, it can demonstrate only un-relatedness. Anything more requires a prior decision on what is the original text. Thus while it is obvious that many mss are clearly unrelated to B, none is demonstrated to be related to B. Though it is true, of course, that Rahlfs, prior to grouping the witnesses on the basis of affiliation need not have worked through all the particulars of the critical text, it is difficult to see how such

---

<sup>10</sup> See further note 20 below.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Martin L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique, Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*. Stuttgart, 1973, 32.

grouping can be done except on the basis of clearly erroneous, i.e., secondary, readings.

Given the fact that Rahlfs' list of test variants is an amalgam of primary and secondary readings, the affiliation of individual witnesses he proposes is not securely based. Thus we are told<sup>12</sup> that the closest relative of B is the Bohairic, and next in order are S and Ethiopic, since they follow the Vulgar text in only 5, 17, and 23 instances respectively in his list. In other words, all three are relatively close to the B-pole of his bi-polar model. But since no determination is made on what constitutes the original text, hence no touchstone is established against which true affiliation can be measured, affiliation of these texts to B must be regarded as not proven and thus must remain *sub iudice*. In other words, if Rahlfs' manuscript groupings turn out to be valid, they are valid in spite of his demonstrations rather than because of them. This point deserves to be emphasized especially at a symposium about the daughter versions of the Greek Psalter, lest alignment of some sort with Rahlfs' groupings be construed prematurely as an important text-historical datum.

One might further demonstrate Rahlfs' *modus operandi* from his treatment of the early fragmentary texts. Already in the *Septuaginta-Studien* he speaks of some of these as being related to B (pp. 103–109), but in *Psalmi cum Odis* (p. 6) we see that many more are linked to his Lower Egyptian, Upper Egyptian and Mixed groups. A few examples must suffice: (a) Ra 2014 (Leipzig, iii cent.) contains Ps 118:27–58, a passage where B is not extant. Thus it is said to belong to the Lower Egyptian group because it agrees a number of times with ms S and Bo. Yet of the eight times it is cited in Rahlfs' apparatus (including for stichometry) four times it supports the lemma (vv. 36, 39, 43, 49), and of the remaining four (vv. 41, 44, 48, 57) only twice (vv. 48, 57) does it agree with S and Bo, and only once (v. 57) uniquely so. Consequently, any argument for textual affiliation stands on a very precarious footing. (b) Ra 2008 (Private, v/vi cent.) contains Ps 5:6–12. As so-called members of the Lower Egyptian group, all three, B S Bo, are extant. Of the four times that 2008 is cited in the apparatus, once (v. 9) it agrees with Rahlfs' lemma, once it deviates uniquely (v. 12) from the lemma, once it agrees with B Bo against S (v. 6) and once it agrees with S against B Bo. Thus again, textual affiliation with the Lower Egyptian group is dubious, to say the least.

The linking of fragmentary texts with the so-called Upper Egyptian group does not fare any better. Again, just two examples: (a) Ra 1119 (Rome, ninth cent.) contains Ps 131:10–12. Of the four times Rahlfs cites it, it supports the lemma twice (v. 11 [bis]), and in neither of the two other cases (10, 11) does it agree uniquely with members of the so-called Upper Egyptian group. To be sure, 1119 is part of a Greek-Sahidic Psalter, but is language a *bona fide* criterion of textual affiliation, the more since parallel texts in different languages, more often than not, are not textual twins? (b) A somewhat more extensive parchment might be expected to be a better candidate for showing textual affiliation. Ra 2018 (London, vii/viii cent.) contains Ps 10:2–11:5, 48:20–49:7, 118:24–38. Of

---

<sup>12</sup>*Septuaginta-Studien* § 10 p. 53.

the 30 times this ms is cited in Rahlfs' apparatus, 11 (10:3, 11:3, 4, 48:21, 49:2, 118:24, 26, 27, 31 33, 35) are in support of the lemma text, and only six (11:3, 49:3, 4, 49:6, 118:35, 36) of the remainder agree with Sa, the mainstay of the Upper Egyptian group, a mere two of which (49:4, 49:6) involve exclusively so-called Upper Egyptian witnesses. As in the case of 1119 we are dealing here with a Greek-Sahidic Psalter, but again how much textual weight can this bear, if any? Other examples of linkage based on slender evidence are not hard to find. Not only does Rahlfs make use of both primary and secondary readings to establish his groupings but he also employs a kind of leap-frog method of forging relationship: if Y is related to X and Z is related to Y, then Z is related to X and the three can be said to constitute a grouping.

Since, as I see it, Rahlfs' method of grouping manuscripts in the Psalter is flawed, I remain to be convinced that there is sufficient warrant for grouping any iv/v century and earlier texts (apart from *O* which Rahlfs calls a special text-type,<sup>13</sup> but which is not attested by any pre-iv/v witness). Manuscript affiliation, i.e., relatedness based exclusively on deviant readings, is something that requires demonstration. In other words, the burden of proof must rest with those who want to assert it. The reason for this, it seems to me, is obvious. Inherent in the grouping of witnesses is the fact that the individual witness loses some of its evidential weight or value when grouped. Thus if S is affiliated with B, S diminishes in text-critical value wherever it appears in company with B. Group attestation is less than the sum of its parts.

In defence of Rahlfs' early groups one might argue that with the discovery of Papyrus Bodmer XXIV (Ra 2110), assigned by its editors to Rahlfs' Upper Egyptian group, we now have extensive Greek attestation for this group. It should, however, be emphasized that 2110 aligns itself with *many* witnesses, and which of those alignments show true textual affiliation can only emerge as we establish the OG text step by step.

What I am essentially arguing is that since nothing is gained by premature classification—and convenience of citation in the *apparatus criticus* is insufficient reason—Rahlfs' delineations for the most part might better be put on suspended animation, as we proceed to tackle the evidence anew.

I turn now more particularly to Rahlfs' treatment of one of the poles in his bipolar model, namely, the so-called Vulgar text. Let us begin with the justification he gives for his monolithic treatment of this text in his *Psalmi cum Odis*.

Die weitaus meisten dieser Hss. [i.e., the reputedly more than 900 extant] enthalten ... die später überall durchgedrungene Rezension Lukians, und so gibt es für diese ein so ungeheures Material, daß dessen Durcharbeitung, wenn sie alles oder auch nur das Wichtigste umfassen sollte, allein schon eine Reihe von Jahren erfordern und gewaltige Geldmittel verschlingen würde. Dazu kommt, daß der Ertrag einer solchen Arbeit aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach sehr gering sein würde, da nach allem, was wir wissen, die Unterschiede

---

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.* §22 p. 109.

zwischen den jüngeren Hss. recht gering sind. Auch sind schon in der großen LXX-Ausgabe von Holmes und Parsons mehr als 100 dieser Hss. kollationiert, und wenn diese Kollationen auch nicht erstklassig sind, so läßt sich aus ihnen zusammengenommen doch ein hinreichend deutliches Bild des späteren Vulgärtextes gewinnen.

Daher habe ich meine Angaben über *L* aus H.-P. entnommen. Kleine Unsicherheiten muß man dabei allerdings in Kauf nehmen; auch kann man *L* nun nicht bis in seine Untergruppen und Untergrüppchen verfolgen. Aber damit scheint mir nichts Wesentliches verloren; ja ich möchte es sogar für einen Gewinn halten, wenn der Blick nicht durch fast immer belanglose kleine Differenzen von der großen Einlichkeit dieser riesigen Hss.-Schar abgelenkt wird.<sup>14</sup>

This might appropriately be called “aus der Not eine Tugend machen.” In passing we might note that, if one limits oneself to mss that pre-date the advent of printing, i.e., fifteenth century and earlier, the total number, by my count, drops to 665, thus a reduction of nearly some 30%. Consequently, the collation task need perhaps not be as immense as Rahlfs intimates.

In the present climate of financial stringency and reduction in research funding for the humanities—unless Deutschland is radically different from Canada in this regard—, one can relate to Rahlfs’ concern. Moreover, to rely, under the circumstances, on the collations of Holmes-Parsons, albeit incomplete and imperfect, is also perhaps understandable, though it does clearly underscore the provisional nature of Rahlfs’ edition. But be that as it may, Rahlfs’ decision not to do new and full collations need not have meant that he treat so-called *L* in as monolithic a manner as he did. One more than suspects that it is a direct consequence of his bi-polar model, though this may be a chicken or egg question: Did the bi-polar model determine the monolithic treatment of *L*, or did his monolithic view of *L* give rise to the bi-polar model? As I will suggest later, his model also had an effect on the critical text.

The scheme he sets forth in *Psalmi cum Odis* is the following:

$L^a$  = 56 to 75 *L*-mss in Holmes-Parsons (i.e., the majority of witnesses)

$L^b$  = 16 to 35 (i.e., the minority of witnesses)

$L^d$  = 36 to 55 (i.e., about half of the witnesses)

$L^{pau}$  = fewer than 16, but at least 3, and occasionally only two.

The reader is warned that no counts are fully guaranteed, and that *e silentio* conclusions based on Holmes-Parsons are marked by a raised <sup>sil</sup> in parentheses following the *L* siglum. Thus, e.g.,  $L^{d(sil)}$ .

The approach Rahlfs takes to the so-called Byzantine text is thus based purely on quantity of witnesses. What matters is how many mss support a given reading, not which ones they are. Delineation into sub-groups and sub-sub-groups was therefore precluded from the outset. Furthermore, though he tells

---

<sup>14</sup>Proleg. §7.2. p. 61.

us that  $L^{\text{pau}}$  may occasionally represent as few as two mss, what he does not tell us is that often he simply ignores the testimony of the few.<sup>15</sup> He also does not warn the reader that such evidence is frequently ignored even when it is supported by older witnesses, which he himself collated. Thus in a variety of stated as well as unstated ways  $L$  is made to appear as a monolith.

P. L. Hedley in his review of Rahlfs' *Psalmi cum Odis* complained that Rahlfs had failed to give due weight to the so-called  $L$  text in establishing his critical text, and one more than suspects that this is due at least in part to its having been portrayed as the monolithic polar opposite to Vaticanus (B). Hedley was moved to write,

No more important piece of work remains to be done on the Greek text of the Psalms than the disentanglement of the ancient element in the Lucianic text and the estimation of its value.<sup>16</sup>

How to deal with the so-called  $L$  problem, in preparation for a new and true Göttingen edition of the Psalter, remains a challenge. I made an attempt when I was much younger to find a scientific way to reduce the bulk of mss to be collated for such an edition. The project was not a success for what in retrospect are obvious reasons. Clearly, full collations remain the ideal, especially since suppleting is a common phenomenon in Psalter mss. Barring that, substantial segments at many points need to be collated continuously, and all the evidence from the titles treated separate from the main text. But let me emphasize that this is decidedly second best. Moreover, it might be advisable to collate the early papyrus and parchment fragments as well as the daughter versions before doing the main collations rather than after, as is Göttingen practice. The trail that leads from the pristine OG text to the common text of the Byzantine period may thus become more readily visible. As I have noted earlier, more so-called  $L$  readings have ancient roots than is evident from Rahlfs' edition.

In conclusion on the text-historical aspect of Rahlfs' work on Greek Psalms, I would suggest that we essentially start over. His bi-polar model is inappropriate and his ms groupings are inadequately based, even if not *ipso facto* erroneous.

## (2) The critical text

### (a) Rahlfs' edition

When Rahlfs' *Psalmi cum Odis* appeared in 1931, it was the first volume in what had been announced as the *editio maior* of the Göttingen Septuaginta, in distinction from the more limited *Handausgabe*, though clearly in comparison

---

<sup>15</sup>Cf. Pietersma, A. *Two Manuscripts of the Greek Psalter in the Chester Beatty Library Dublin*. (Analecta Biblica 77.) Rome, 1978, 16–37.

<sup>16</sup>*Op. cit.* 71.

with subsequent editions, what it featured was rather circumscribed and limited. No new collations were made for the numerical majority of Greek manuscripts, very little patristic evidence was included, and similarly only some of the daughter versions were represented. Furthermore, though Hexaplaric evidence appears sporadically in the apparatus, no attempt was made to cite it systematically or to group it in a second apparatus. That practice was to come later in the evolution of the Göttingen Septuaginta. Rahlfs was keenly aware of the fact that his edition might not live up to every expectation, but he judged it to be of greater benefit to scholarship to publish early than to wait till he was completely ready.<sup>17</sup> We stand forever in his debt for having done so.

Nevertheless, we should keep reminding ourselves that *Psalmi cum Odis* is but a provisional critical edition and, in that sense, can scarcely be called the first published volume in the *editio maior* of the Göttingen Septuaginta. For the *editio maior*, the Psalter remains to be done, as this Symposium pointedly demonstrates.

The total number of witnesses cited for Psalms on Rahlfs' own authority is 59 Greek mss and five daughter versions (Bo Ga La Sa Sy). All but six of the mss (A B R S 1219 55) are in very fragmentary condition, some containing as little as a single verse each. Of Apostolic/Patristic evidence, he tells us, he has fully collated only Augustine (notably his *Enarrationes in Psalmos*), Hesychius of Jerusalem (his commentary on the Psalms), Jerome (with special focus on the letter to *Sunnia et Fretela*), and Theodoret, though he cites from time to time an additional 15, often from the best available editions but sometimes from manuscript.<sup>18</sup> Thus it is immediately obvious that, though, numerically, the total of the freshly collated material is reasonably impressive, the actual volume of evidence is rather slim. We have already had occasion to note that this textual information is then bolstered by the undigested mass of manuscripts cited on the authority of Holmes-Parsons.

The textual witnesses thus incorporated are classified into the six divisions he had already delineated in his *Septuaginta-Studien* of 1907. These are the following:

- (1) The text of Lower Egypt (hereafter LE), comprised of B S Bo, plus nine fragments (2008 2014 2019 2037 2039 2042 2044 2049 2051).<sup>19</sup>
- (2) The text of Upper Egypt (hereafter UE), comprised of U 2013 Sa, plus a further 16 fragments (1093 1119 1220 1221 2009 2015 2017 2018 2032 2033 2034 2035 2038 2046 2050 2052).
- (3) The "abendländische" or Western text (hereafter WE), comprised of R La<sup>R</sup> La<sup>G</sup>, plus Augustine, Tertullian, and Cyprian.

---

<sup>17</sup>Vorwort 5.

<sup>18</sup>They are: Ambrose, Barnabas, Chrysostom, Clement of Alexandria, Clement of Rome, Apostolic Constitutions, Cyprian, Cyril of Alexandria, the Didascalia, Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Origen, Tertullian, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theophilus of Antioch.

<sup>19</sup>In *Septuaginta-Studien* §65, this group is identified with the Hesychian recension but no longer in *Psalmi cum Odis*.

(4) The Origenian or Hexaplaric recension (hereafter *O*), comprised of 1098 2005 GaHi(+Uulg).

(5) The Lucianic recension (hereafter *L*), comprised of T Z B<sup>c</sup> S<sup>c</sup> R<sup>c</sup> 1046 2040 Syriac, Chrysostom, Hesychius (of Jerusalem), *Sunnia et Fretela*, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret, plus 119 of the mss cited in Holmes-Parsons, some of which are in fact commentaries rather than Psalter manuscripts *per se*, and a few of which are now listed in Rahlfs' *Verzeichnis* as lost (13 21[lost] 39[lost] 43 65 66 69 70[=1114 and 1115] 80 81 99 100 101 102 104[com]106 111 112 113 114[lost] 115[lost] 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 150 151 152 154 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 185[com] 187 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 199 200 201 202 203 204[com] 205 206 208 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218[lost] 219 222 223 225 226 227 263 264 265 266 267 268 270 271 272 273 274[com] 275 276[com] 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286[com] 287 289[com] 290 291 292 293 294).<sup>20</sup>

(6) The mixed group (hereafter MG),<sup>21</sup> comprised of A 1219 55, plus 21 fragments (2002 2003 2004 2006 2010 2011 2012 2016 2020 2021 2022 2025 2027 2029 2030 2031 2036 2043 2047 2048 2054).

The more serious problems involved in Rahlfs' grouping of textual witnesses I have already dealt with in part one of my paper. Here I focus on the use Rahlfs makes of his classifications in establishing his critical text. Leaving aside his sixth or mixed group, Rahlfs begins by delineating his remaining five into what he terms "die drei alten Textformen," the Upper Egyptian, Lower Egyptian, and the Western, in distinction from the two younger recensions, the Origenian and Lucianic. He then moves on to formulate his four principles or guidelines that are intended to assist him in recovering the OG text. Briefly stated, they run as follows:

- (1) When the three older groups (UE, LE, WE) are in agreement, that reading is counted as OG.<sup>22</sup>
- (2) When the three older groups disagree among themselves, the reading which equals the Masoretic Text is deemed to be OG.

<sup>20</sup>Rahlfs excludes from *L* the Greek-Latin bilinguals 27 156 188 but apparently includes 65 171 277 290. Also excluded are Theodoret mss: 184 210 288 (see Proleg. 62).

<sup>21</sup>Not without interest is the exact wording he uses: "Mischtexte und nicht sicher einzureihende Texte." (*Psalmi cum Odis*, 6) Since "Mischtexte" implies contamination by other texts, it tends to promote a pejorative use of the witnesses so labeled. Preferable would be a neutral label such as "unclassified texts," since contamination is a matter of *quod est demonstrandum*. The second part of Rahlfs' statement suggests that all texts not assigned to this group can be grouped with certainty. I have already noted that this is far from being the case. It also bears noting that the grouping of A 1219 55 is based solely on their shared corruption of  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$  to  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\theta\eta$  in Ps 26:1. See *Psalmi cum Odis*, 70 (§8.1).

<sup>22</sup>See, however, *Septuaginta-Studien* §61 pp 229–30 for a list of shared secondary readings by these groups.

(3) When the older groups disagree with MT, while the younger recensions (*O* and *L*) agree with MT, the former should be counted as OG and the latter should be discounted as being a Hebraizing correction.

(4) When none of the first three rules applies, Rahlfs proposes to follow the lead of B + S, though he is loath to do so when these two stand alone.

Rahlfs' stated criteria for selecting his critical text have a clear focus. Pride of place in his procedure has been assigned to manuscript combinations, or rather combinations and configurations of text-groups. Central to Rahlfs' procedure is that certain text-groups manifest a certain alignment. Differently put, if certain configurations occur among the groups, we can be reasonably confident of what the OG text must have been.

Inherent in Rahlfs' approach is, it seems to me, a number of problematic assumptions. His first three rules are all based on the relative age of the ms groupings. But how sure can we be that UE, LE, WE *qua* groups (on the assumption that they are *bona fide* groups) antedate the iii century, the reputed date of the Origenian and Lucianic recensions? For Rahlfs' formulation it is clearly not sufficient to note that individual mss are at least as old as the iv century. Furthermore, while it is true that the recensions of Origen and Lucian were made (to the best of our knowledge) in the iii century, this clearly has relevance only for *the recensional material*. The base text in both cases must be older. Thus Rahlfs' third rule makes sense only if one has already determined that a given item is recensional and hence secondary. But that is precisely the question Rahlfs' criteria are meant to establish: What is primary and what is secondary? What is original and what is not?

Incidentally, I noted earlier P. L. Hedley's complaint that Rahlfs' criteria were stacked against a proper use of the so-called Lucianic or Byzantine text.<sup>23</sup> Obviously, between being portrayed as the monolithic polar opposite to ms Vaticanus (B) and being assigned junior status among the groups, the *L* text did not stand much of a chance of being taken seriously as a worthy representative of OG.

I have argued elsewhere<sup>24</sup> that, rather than assigning configurations of manuscript groupings—or for that matter configurations of individual manuscripts—pride of place in one's list of criteria for establishing the critical text, one ought to begin with an exhaustive analysis of translation technique in the broadest possible sense of that term. Whatever in the way of Hebrew-Greek equations and Greek detail not linked to Hebrew can thus be uncovered as a footprint of the translator becomes, for a modern editor, the Archimedean point in text-criticism, which allows him/her to move the 'earth' of variants. Only when the quest for the Archimedean point fails should other criteria come into play, such as general (demonstrated) reliability of manuscripts (or possibly manuscript groupings), age of individual witnesses, what earlier modern editions

---

<sup>23</sup>*Op. cit.* 71.

<sup>24</sup>Pietersma, Albert, "Septuagint Research," *Vetus Testamentum* 35 (1985) 296–311 [299–300].

read, and perhaps even the flipping of a coin, when we do what we do because we must do something. But there is, in my view, a strict hierarchy in the steps that one takes, and failing to heed that hierarchy is liable to produce a picture that is out of focus.

In fairness to Rahlfs, it deserves to be noted, however, that he was too good a text-critic to be hamstrung by his own rules. Thus, not infrequently one comes upon lemma readings in *Psalmi cum Odis* that have obviously been arrived at contrary to the criteria Rahlfs laid down in the Prolegomena.<sup>25</sup>

In my article in the Hanhart Festschrift<sup>26</sup> I noted *inter alia* that the Greek Psalter, more than any other book included in the collection popularly labeled the Septuagint, has had a complex transmission history. Its Hebrew parent as liturgical text of Second Temple Judaism is attested in more copies than any other biblical book among the finds in the Judaean Desert. As hymnbook first of Greek speaking Jewry and later of the Christian Church, the Septuagint Psalter was similarly transmitted in multiple copies. Furthermore, more Greek translations are attested for the book of Psalms than for any other book. We have already seen that ten times as many mss of the Septuagint Psalter are extant than for any other Septuagint book. Papyri and parchments pre-dating the seventh century number well over a hundred, and the total keeps growing steadily. One may well ask what the effect has been of this transmission history on the present state of our evidence. While it is true that the more a text is copied the more it is subjected to occasion for change, it is perhaps equally true that frequent copying tends to have a leveling effect.<sup>27</sup> Thus Rahlfs was quite correct when he stated that the history of the Greek Psalter since the iii century AD has been one of the ever growing dominance of the so-called Lucianic text, even though, as I have argued, his bipolar model is at cross-purposes with due recognition of this fact. I would go a step farther and suggest that this leveling process characterizes the entire history of the Greek Psalter, more than the text-history of any other biblical book. If that is correct (and I will return to it presently) we can expect that much traditional material lies deeply embedded in our present body of evidence. Moreover, we may even have to expect that, at times, not a single one of our current witnesses has retained the pristine reading of the OG.

At a symposium on the daughter versions of the Greek Psalter, it would seem permissible to pause a moment at this juncture for a commercial or promotional break in favour of “die Tochterübersetzungen.” Since the daughter versions typically reflect the Greek text current at the time (and place) of their own inception, they regularly play an important role in deciphering not only questions

---

<sup>25</sup> “Ra 2110 (P. Bodmer XXIV) and the Text of the Greek Psalter.” *Studien zur Septuaginta — Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 20 (edd. D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, J. W. Wevers; Göttingen, 1990) pp. 262-286 [264–65].

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien* p. 237.

of text history but also from time to time problems of original text. If the leveling process in the Greek Psalter has been as extensive as I have suggested, the daughter versions potentially play a proportionately greater role than in any other book.

I now turn to some specifics in Rahlfs' *Psalmi cum Odis*. On thirteen occasions in his edition, Rahlfs concluded that all extant textual witnesses had gone astray and that, consequently, none could be relied upon to give us the OG text. Of these thirteen emendations the largest number (10) had already been proposed by Grabe<sup>28</sup> (21:18, 29:12<sup>29</sup>, 48:10, 58:5, 64:4, 68:27, 73:8, 77:36, 77:54, 137:2) but an additional three were added by Rahlfs himself (21:32, 41:9, 118:33). On eight further occasions he notes, in his apparatus, emendations proposed by others but rejected by himself (7:14, 15:8, 15:11, 16:13, 21:3[bis], 118:28, 138:20). P. L. Hedley, in his searching review of Rahlfs, was convinced that Rahlfs should have emended more often than he did. In fact, in the realm of emendation Hedley calls him "almost a total abstainer."<sup>30</sup> Perhaps Hedley was right but if err one must, I would rather err on the side of caution. Nevertheless, the general direction into which Hedley sought to push Rahlfs is correct, it seems to me. Not for nothing did Rahlfs himself on many occasions select as OG a reading with extremely slender support. I note some two dozen of these: 4:5, 4:8, 21:28, 30:16, 31:5, 32:15, 39:7, 45:3, 47:3, 47:10, 58:12, 59:2, 61:5, 67:9, 71:18, 77:31, 77:71, 88:20, 93:6, 101:27, 103:24, 105:26, 118:143, 137:8, 138:14. Some of these have since been bolstered by new evidence. Beyond this list, one may point to a further half dozen instances, at a minimum, in which the famous Papyrus Bodmer XXIV (Ra 2110) has uniquely (or virtually so) preserved the OG text: 21:9, 24:15, 57:10, 77:60, 87:10, 93:7, 107:11(bis).<sup>31</sup> What all of this underscores, I would submit, is what I have already suggested, namely, that the layers of tradition in the Psalter are not only thick but also broad—and there is more evidence of this in Rahlfs' edition.

Eight times Rahlfs placed within square brackets items which in his judgment had no claim to being original but which commanded considerable support in the textual traditions. These comprise from a single word, ἀναστάσεως in 65:1 (omitted by S O = MT), to a series of eight stichoi in 13:3 (omitted by L Tht A 55 = MT), the well-known insert from Rom 3:13–18. The remaining cases are 17:20<sup>3–4</sup> (omitted by Ga L Tht = MT), 24:14<sup>2</sup> (omitted by S Sa<sup>B\*</sup> La<sup>G</sup> Ga L Tht Sy = MT), 70:21<sup>3</sup> (omitted by S Sa Ga = MT), 118:104<sup>3</sup> (omitted by Sa Ga Aug<sup>uar</sup> L Tht A = MT), 134:17<sup>2–5</sup> (omitted by S Uulg L Tht Sy 55 Cyp

<sup>28</sup>Ioannes Ernestus Grabe (ed.), *Septuaginta Interpretum tom. ultimus, continens Psalmorum, Iobi . . . libros*. Oxford, 1709.

<sup>29</sup>Independently proposed by P. de Lagarde in *Psalterii graeci quinquagena prima*. Göttingen, 1892

<sup>30</sup>*Op. cit.* 71.

<sup>31</sup>For a discussion of most of these see my "Ra 2110 . . ." For 2110 see further my "Articulation in the Greek Psalms: The Evidence of Papyrus Bodmer XXIV." *Tradition of the Text: Studies offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 109 (edd. G. J. Norton and S. Pisano; Freiburg/Göttingen: 1991), pp.184-202.

= MT), 146:8<sup>4</sup> (omitted by Sa La<sup>G</sup> A = MT). There can be no doubt—and Rahlfs would agree—that from a strictly text-critical point of view none of the items I have just mentioned deserves the status he accords them. But Rahlfs was clearly a text-critic with a deep reverence for tradition, and the balancing act he performs is of interest, to say the least. Thus again, the profound effect of tradition on the Greek Psalter is clearly in evidence on the pages of Rahlfs' edition. And though he may perhaps be labeled a traditionalist, he also clearly points the way toward a more *fully critical* edition of the Psalter.

The final item I want to touch on here is the inclusion of the Odes in Rahlfs' edition: *Psalmi cum Odis*. As is clear from §10 of the Prolegomena, the official nine Odes of the Greek Church (Exod 15:1–19, Deut 32:1–43, 1Rgns 2:1–10, Hab 3:2–19, Isa 26:9–20, Jonah 2:3–10, Dan 3:26–45, Dan 3:52–88, Lk 1:46–55, 68–79) and the additional five from elsewhere (Isa 5:1–9, Isa 38:10–20, Prayer of Manasseh, Lk 2:29–32, Gloria) owe their association with Psalms to ecclesiastical tradition. Moreover, neither ms B nor S, both from the iv century, as yet includes them. But since a critical edition of the Psalter intrinsically aims at recovering the shape it had at its inception, the Odes belong even less than the bracketed accretions. By including them nevertheless, Rahlfs has given a distinctively Christian twist to the text-critical undertaking. The *New English Translation of the Septuagint* (NETS), sponsored by the IOSCS, will accordingly not include them.

In closing this section of my paper, I cite P. L. Hedley's pronouncement of 1933, with which I fully concur,

He [Rahlfs] must be congratulated on the production of a book that not only carries the study of the Greek Psalter a long step forward, but must for many years form the foundation of all work in that field.<sup>32</sup>

The year 1997 marks the 66th anniversary of the appearance of *Psalmi cum Odis* and it remains without rival in the field. To be sure this is a tribute to Rahlfs' admittedly provisional edition; it is also testimony to the great need for a fully critical Göttingen edition.

(b) 1931–97 and beyond

In conclusion allow me to touch briefly on what has happened since 1931. Later in the present symposium we will hear about the famous discoveries in the Judaean Desert. I have already noted that the Book of Psalms is represented in more copies than any other biblical book. To what extent these finds contribute to our understanding of the Septuagint Psalter remains to be assessed. My own preliminary assessment suggests that Qumran has relatively little to contribute to its history. To be sure there are some alignments of the Septuagint with Qumran, such as the missing nun-verse of Ps 144 (v. 13<sup>a</sup>) and scores of items

---

<sup>32</sup>*Op. cit.* 72.

that freely arise in transmission history. But since, in such cases, we are either dealing with questions of *Vorlage* (i.e., different from MT) or with parallel scribal errors, we are clearly not dealing with affiliation in any text historical sense.<sup>33</sup> Needless to say, surface alignments of Greek witnesses with Qumran mss must be demonstrated to be of text-critical significance. Listing them is a very small first step.

Since the appearance of Rahlfs' *Psalmi cum Odis* in 1931 many Greek mss have been discovered. Already in 1978<sup>34</sup> I was able to add well over 100 items to Rahlfs' 50 papyri and parchments, and more have appeared since. Two in particular bear noting because of their size: Papyrus Chester Beatty XIII (Rahlfs no. 2149), which contains Psalm 72–88<sup>35</sup>, and Papyrus Bodmer XXIV (Rahlfs no. 2110), which comprises Psalms 17:45–118:44.<sup>36</sup> Though, as I have shown elsewhere, 2149 cannot be said to have preserved, uniquely, readings of the OG text, there are many instances in which it lends valuable iv century support for Rahlfs' lemma as well as for revisions to the text of Rahlfs.<sup>37</sup> More extensive and correspondingly more valuable than 2149 is 2110, a papyrus dated by its editor to the iii/iv century AD. Though Dominique Barthélemy<sup>38</sup> with the assistance of C. H. Roberts subsequently assigned it a ii century or pre-Origen date, since Origen was thought to have known it, the iii/iv century date of the *editio princeps* has since been re-affirmed by the Oxford palaeographers Revell Coles, John Rea, and Peter Parsons.<sup>39</sup> While it would have been most interesting to have such an extensive pre-Hexaplaric witness, such a conclusion can be sustained neither on palaeographical nor on textual grounds.<sup>40</sup>

The importance of 2110 is thus its early date, its extent—it comprises approximately three quarters of the Psalter—and its reputed membership in what

---

<sup>33</sup>A survey of alignments with both Rahlfs' critical text and variants thereto has been given in Peter W. Flint's (unpublished) dissertation, "The Psalters at Qumran and the Book of Psalms," ch. 10 pp. 199–207. University of Notre Dame, 1993 (see now his *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls & the Book of Psalms*. Brill, Leiden: 1997 pp. 228–36. Mr. Tyler Williams, under my direction, has begun work on a Toronto dissertation entitled, "The Greek Psalter and the Finalization of the Hebrew Book of Psalms," in which the relationship between the LXX and Qumran will be assessed in detail.

<sup>34</sup>*Two Manuscripts* pp. 6–15.

<sup>35</sup>For the text see the previous note and further "New Greek Fragments of Biblical Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Library," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 24 (1987) [1990] pp. 37–61

<sup>36</sup>Kasser, R. and M. Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer XXIV*. Cologny-Geneva, 1967. For corrections to the edition princeps see my "The Edited Text of P. Bodmer XXIV," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 17 (1980) pp. 67–79.

<sup>37</sup>*Two Manuscripts*, ch. IV (some 7 revisions are proposed).

<sup>38</sup>"Psautier Grec et le Papyrus XXIV," *Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie* 19(1969), 106–110 and "Papyrus Bodmer 24 jugé par Origène," in J. Schreiner (ed.) *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch* 1. Festschrift für Joseph Ziegler. Würzburg, 1972, 11-19.

<sup>39</sup>Private correspondence from Parsons dated August 8, 1992.

<sup>40</sup>For the textual argument see my "Origen's Corrections and the Text of P. Bodmer XXIV," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 19(1995) 133–42

Rahlfs had labeled the text of Upper Egypt, the main stay of which was the Sahidic daughter version. I have already suggested that since Rahlfs' manuscript groupings are still *sub iudice*, they be suspended. In the meanwhile, there can be no doubt that 2110 is a first-rate witness to OG, and in articles in the Hanhart and Barthélemy Festschriften I have begun to mine it for its OG content. Already in 1969 Barthélemy<sup>41</sup> had called for an analysis of 2110 as a major step toward recovering the pristine text of the Greek Psalter. Much remains to be done and one of my current graduate students intends to take up the challenge of launching a full-scale study of this important manuscript. What papyrus 967 is to Ezekiel 2110 is to the Psalter. It alone would demand a re-doing of Rahlfs' *Psalmi cum Odis*.

In more ways than one, Rahlfs in his provisional edition has shown the way to future editors of Psalms. With due caution and sensitivity the layers of tradition need to be stripped away. Rahlfs already placed some of these within square brackets. That process needs to continue, namely, the tagging of items that can be shown to be secondary in spite of their widespread support in our textual traditions. Their rightful place is in the history of interpretation, not in that of original text. What was placed within square brackets in 1931, should no doubt be moved to the apparatus in 1997. I note here some additional units that are suspect to varying degrees: 7:12<sup>1b</sup>[καὶ ἰσχυρὸς καὶ μακρόθυμος], 12:6<sup>4</sup>, 13:1<sup>3b</sup>[οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός], 17:36<sup>4</sup>, 28:1<sup>2</sup>, 30:1 [ἐκστάσεως], 32:10<sup>3</sup>, 36:28<sup>4</sup>, 37:21<sup>3</sup>, 72:28<sup>4</sup>, 87:6 [ἐρριμμένοι], 113:11<sup>1b+2</sup>[ἄνω – γῆ], 117:2, 3, 4, 6 [ὅτι ἀγαθός], 133:1<sup>4</sup>, 135:16<sup>3-4</sup>, 135:26<sup>3-4</sup>, 137:1<sup>2</sup>, 148:5<sup>2</sup>.

Especially the superscriptions of individual Psalms need to be scrutinized. Already in my *Two Manuscripts*<sup>42</sup> (1978) I argued that even if, as Rahlfs notes from time to time, certain superscriptions are pre-Christian, that by no means proves that they were translated from Hebrew. Furthermore, lexical differences between Greek superscriptions with counterparts in MT, on the one hand, and Greek superscriptions without such counterparts, on the other, do not enhance the likelihood that the latter rest on a Hebrew base. The process of adding superscriptions clearly continued unimpeded by the Psalter's having been translated from Hebrew into Greek.<sup>43</sup>

A case in point are the superscriptions that associate certain Psalms with given days of the week: 23, 37, 47, 80, 91, 92, 93. Only the superscription of 91 is also found in MT. Of the remainder, four (23, 37, 47, 92) are attested by most witnesses; one (93) is attested by all witnesses, and one (80) is attested only in daughter versions (La<sup>RAug</sup> Aeth Arm La Sa) of the Greek, and was relegated by Rahlfs to his apparatus. Rahlfs thought that all were of Jewish origin. But if one

---

<sup>41</sup>See note 38 above.

<sup>42</sup>Pp. 52–53 note 1.

<sup>43</sup>On the increasing assignation to David see my "David in the Greek Psalms," *Vetus Testamentum* 30 (1980) 213–26.

accepts that—and 80 raises questions about this—Jewish origin does not necessarily mean that they are original to the Greek Psalter. Rahlfs in fact

speaks of them as “Zusätze” in his Prolegomena.<sup>44</sup> Thus, interestingly, he again points the way, though unlike the Christian “Zusätze” he mentions in the same context, those of Jewish origin are not placed within square brackets. Consequently, if including the Odes adds, as I have suggested, a distinctively Christian twist to his edition, here we see a balancing Jewish twist.

Hedley<sup>45</sup> thought that the textual evidence for the omission of the week-day notations in 23, 47 and 92 should relegate not only those superscriptions but that of 93 as well to secondary status. Arie van der Kooij,<sup>46</sup> basing himself on Tamid vii 4 and thus interpreting them all as liturgical notes, believed that all were original and pointed to a Palestinian origin of the Greek Psalter (curiously he made no reference to Psalm 80). Neither view, in my judgement, is defensible but here I will simply give some pointers: (a) in view of the often awkward way in which the Psalter translator deals with the superscriptions, the grammatical and lexical variations among them suggest more than a single origin; (b) though the grammatical construction in 47 and 93 may well reflect a liturgical notation

(δευτέρα/τετράδι κτλ.), the εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν κτλ. phrase of 91 and 92 is intended to refer to the subject matter of the Psalm rather than to its liturgical use, as is the case in Ps 71:1 regarding Solomon (εἰς Σαλωμων); the genitive

construction of 23 (τῆς μιᾶς κτλ.) is some what ambiguous, but likely exegetical; (c) unless one counts the versional witness in Psalm 80 as original, there is clear evidence that references to days of the week were added secondarily (and seemingly by Christians); (d) in reference to Psalm 23, Theodoret states that the Hexapla lacks any mention of day one,<sup>47</sup> and Origen says he did not omit items from his Greek; (e) Ps 37, like 91, makes reference to the last day of the week (περὶ σαββάτου), though this once again (cf. 91 and 92) refers not to liturgical use but to perceived content (the entire notation runs: “regarding a reminder about the sabbath”). I doubt that the second part of Rahlfs’ confident assertion: “[These superscriptions are] zweifellos jüdischer Herkunft ... , da sie angeben, an welchen Tagen die betreffenden Psalmen im jüdischen Gottesdienst verwendet wurden,”<sup>48</sup> —the second part of this, I doubt can be sustained.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup>p. 72.

<sup>45</sup>*Op. cit.* 65.

<sup>46</sup>“On the Place of Origin of the Old Greek of Psalms,” *Vetus Testamentum* 33(1983) 67–74.

<sup>47</sup>The 1953 edition of the Vulgate lacks the obelos Rahlfs’ ms (Vatic. Regin. 11, eighth cent.) contains.

<sup>48</sup>*Psalmi cum Odis*, 72.

<sup>49</sup>The same doubt extends to Rahlfs’ claim that the Christian addition of ἀνάσπεως in 65:1 assigns this psalm to liturgical use on Sunday. More likely this psalm was thought to be about resurrection (cf. vv. 9, 12). Similarly, ἐξοδίου σκηνῆς of 28:1 does not indicate that this psalm was sung on the last day of Booths (§9.1.4). but rather that its subject matter was thought to be the going forth of the Tabernacle (cf. Numb 1:51). One might in fact argue that Rahlfs’ exclusively liturgical, rather than exegetical, interpretation tricks him into thinking that they must be of Jewish rather than Christian origin. Furthermore, in view of the fact that the vast majority of the narrative superscriptions are exegetical in origin rather than liturgical, and that the Sabbath psalm Ps 91(92) is so understood in the Greek, if not in the

As a concluding example, let me mention the superscription of Psalm 26(27)

which in Rahlfs' text reads: τοῦ Δαυιδ, πρὸ τοῦ χρισθῆναι. The first phrase has דודל as counterpart in MT,<sup>50</sup> but the clause πρὸ τοῦ χρισθῆναι is unique to the Greek and is supported by all extant witnesses. Rahlfs was persuaded by Emil Schürer's argument<sup>51</sup> that the phrase refers to the anointing of the Jewish high priest and is, therefore, of clearly Jewish origin. Presumably for this reason he does not bracket it.<sup>52</sup> Not only is this interpretation difficult to justify grammatically, but a much more parsimonious explanation is readily available. For the key we turn to v. 5, which runs as follows:

5 ὅτι ἔκρυψέν με ἐν σκηνῇ ἐν ἡμέρα κακῶν μου·  
ἔσκέπασέν με ἐν ἀποκρύφῳ τῆς σκηνῆς αὐτοῦ,  
ἐν πέτρῳ ὑψώσέν με·

5 because he hid me in a tent in the day of my troubles;  
he sheltered me in a secret spot of his tent;  
high on a rock he set me.

There is good reason to believe that, in line with Pentateuchal usage, σκηνή (sg) in the Psalms was reserved, by the Greek translator, for the tabernacle.<sup>53</sup> But whether by intent (as I would argue) or by inadvertence, he clearly produced a text that begged for association with the life of David. Given the link with David already in the superscription, inherited from the Hebrew *Vorlage* (= MT), what would be easier than to read v. 5 as a reference to his flight from Saul and his fateful visit to the tabernacle at Nob (1Rgns 21), where he was seen by Doeg the Idumaeon, who also makes his appearance in the superscription to Psalm 51(52)?<sup>54</sup> But this episode obviously took place before David was anointed king over Judah (2Rgns 2:4) and Israel (2Rgns 5:3). Hence the universally attested superscription in the Greek: “(Pertaining to David), before he was anointed.”

Since Rahlfs put a distinctly Jewish interpretation on the reference to anointing, he did not bracket it, even though he speaks of it as a “Zusatz.” My

---

Hebrew, suggests that any liturgical interpretation requires demonstration, and should not be assumed.

<sup>50</sup> τῶ should be read for τοῦ with A U R L 55 Tht.

<sup>51</sup> Not repeated in “the new Schürer” by Vermes and Millar.

<sup>52</sup> Both Hedley (*op. cit.* 65), and van der Kooij (*op. cit.* 74) follow Rahlfs' (and Schürer's) lead.

<sup>53</sup> Only in 27(26):5 and 6 does לִמְנוּחַי (sg) become σκηνή; elsewhere it is translated (15x) by σκηνώμα.

Similarly מִשְׁכָּנִי is regularly translated by σκηνώμα, except in 78(77):60 where the reference is explicitly to Shiloh (Σηλω). מִשְׁכָּנִי in all three of its occurrences (18[17]:12, 27[26]:5, 31[30]:21) is rendered by σκηνή. See further 42(41):5 where מִשְׁכָּנִי is construed as ἐν τόπῳ σκηνῆς. In 26:6 σκηνή may have been intended to refer to 2 Rgns 6:17 and 1 Chr 15:1, in which case the tent David pitched for the ark was equated with the tabernacle (cf. also 2 Rgns 7:2, 6).

<sup>54</sup> For 26:5<sup>3</sup> see 1Rgns 23:25, 28.

reinterpretation does not necessarily presuppose a Jewish origin, but pointedly raises a

different question: Since the Greek translator understood v. 5 as referring to David and his stay at the tabernacle, did he perchance also add the note in the superscription to his being anointed king? Such a conclusion is possible, but in view of his translation approach in general and his often awkward *modus operandi* in the superscriptions in particular, that would appear unlikely. Thus, either the note was already in his Hebrew *Vorlage* or it belongs to the transmission history of the Greek Psalter. I strongly suspect that the latter is the case, the more since the Hebrew text with its use of סבה and אהל in v. 5 (but not משכן), much less obviously lends itself to linkage with the tabernacle. And if that is correct, it cannot be assigned to the critical text, but instead belongs to the history of interpretation of the Greek Psalter—which in no way diminishes its importance.

It would not be difficult to continue adding detail upon detail on the minutiae of the text of the Greek Psalter. But these are for the new edition. As I noted at the outset of my presentation, I have thought it my task to focus primarily on the larger issues.

Two-thirds of a century ago Rahlfs' *Psalmi cum Odis* saw the light of day, even though its author was fully aware of its decidedly provisional nature. A full-fledged critical edition of the Greek Psalter has yet to be produced for the Göttingen Septuaginta and thus remains a *desideratum* of the highest order. As other volumes roll off the press, the absence of the Bible's premier book becomes ever more glaring. Biblical scholarship will be forever indebted to the Akademie der Wissenschaften and the Septuaginta-Unternehmen for having convened this symposium, a small but crucial first step in completing what Alfred Rahlfs so brilliantly began and what the Göttingen Septuaginta has already achieved for many other books. No less, I believe, is owed to one of Göttingen's great.